

March 19, 1976

peated occasions was that of the Senator from the near North side, Senator Chambers, on Senator DeCamp's bicycle bill of years ago. You will recall that we repeatedly gutted the bicycle bill, stripped it completely and substituted the district by election in Omaha, not once but several times. That ultimately went on to passage. I site this merely as the most classic example of this practice. It's something accepted by the body. In other words, when an issue seems to be of that paramount importance that 25 members wish to make that the issue in a bill by completely stripping the bill, then we have done it, we have accepted it. Custom and precedence say that we can.

I would urge you to overrule the Chair on this. As I say, if we were trying to retain the original language or any portion of it, and if we then tried adding this bill I would consider that inappropriate unless there were some clear-cut germaness. There is not and we don't claim that there is. We do say though, as I have stated, that enough precedent has been set that you can strip one bill and substitute a complete separate bill with 25 votes. I would recommend to you that the issue is of such paramount importance that you have an obligation to do that.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature. Senator DeCamp is absolutely correct. I have, in the past, done exactly what is being attempted now, but I am not aware of anybody referring to a rule and challenging it on the basis of what the rules state. A law can be 100 percent unconstitutional, but until such time as it is challenged in court and declared to be unconstitutional it is the law.

Now not long ago in this session Senator DeCamp attempted to take a bill of mine, which had failed on Final Reading which dealt with the same subject matter of regulating special deputies and so forth, and tried to get the Legislature to allow him to insert the provisions of 782 into 432. That was an attempt to make a substitution. The Legislature decided that even though the subject matters were closely related and dealt with the same sections of statute, this would not be done this session.

Now whether or not the Legislature has engaged in the practice in the past is not determinative of whether or not a rule exists in the book. A rule is here and the rule means what the words say that rule means. Now if nobody challenges an issue then that issue can proceed as though no rule existed. For example, we have said, on General File, to amend a bill, not amend an amendment but to amend a bill, it takes 25 votes. If the Clerk or the Chairman lapsed momentarily and allowed a motion to be adopted to amend a bill with less than 25 votes and nobody challenged it and intervening material came then that amendment is adopted with less than 25 votes in spite of what the rule said. The challenge has to occur while the issue is before the body without intervening matter. This issue is before the body. LB 434 is a bill dealing with meat and the rest of.... You know what the bill deals with. Wait a minute. Is 434 a meat cutters bill? Maybe they are related, Senator DeCamp, wherever you are. But as I interpret language I really don't think they actually are. LB 434.... Oh, Senator Swigart